arXiv:1601.01350v1 [astro-ph.GA] 6 Jan 2016

Scalar Field (Wave) Dark Matter

Tonatiuh Matos* and Victor H. Robles**
Departamento de Física,Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, AP 14-740, 0700 D.F., México

ABSTRACT

Recent high-quality observations of dwarf and low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies have shown that their dark matter (DM) halos prefer flat central density profiles. On the other hand the standard cold dark matter model simulations predict a more cuspy behavior. Feedback from star formation has been widely used to reconcile simulations with observations, this might be successful in field dwarf galaxies but its success in low mass galaxies remains uncertain. One model that have received much attention is the scalar field dark matter model. Here the dark matter is a self-interacting ultra light scalar field that forms a cosmological Bose-Einstein condensate, a mass of $10^{-22}\mathrm{eV/c^2}$ is consistent with flat density profiles in the centers of dwarf spheroidal galaxies, reduces the abundance of small halos, might account for the rotation curves even to large radii in spiral galaxies and has an early galaxy formation. The next generation of telescopes will provide better constraints to the model that will help to distinguish this particular alternative to the standard model of cosmology shedding light into the nature of the mysterious dark matter.

Subject headings: dark matter: scalar field

1. INTRODUCTION

The standard model of cosmology assumes the dark matter is cold and effectively collisionless, the galaxies are formed in a hierarchical way, and as they evolve they are subject to frequent collisions and interactions with nearby galaxies that determined the properties that we observed today.

The standard model, also called cold dark matter (CDM) model, is remarkably successful to describe the large scale structure of the universe, as well as large scale observations. Nowadays, galactic observations are becoming more precise that it is possible to assess some of the predictions from the CDM model with more reliability. Moreover, the numerical simulations are rapidly reaching the required resolution to study the inner parts of dwarf galaxies, that is within ∼500pc. Increasing the resolution has revealed that some discrepancies between the observations and the theoretical expectations might require careful revision to our understanding.

One of them is the longstanding core/cusp discussion, whether the central dark matter (DM) profiles in dwarfs and low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies are more core-like and rounder than the standard cold dark matter (CDM) model predicts (see van Eymeren et al. (2009); see de Blok (2010) for a review). The core profiles most frequently used in the literature and that best fit the observations are empirical (Burkert 1995; Kuzio de Naray et al. 2010). Albeit useful to characterize properties of galaxies, it is desirable to find a theoretical framework capable to produce the cores, since CDM suggest central densities in small galaxies going as $\rho \sim r^{-1}$ at small r (Navarro et al. 2010) whereas observations of LSB galaxies suggest a core-like behavior ($\rho \sim r^{-0.2}$) (Oh et al. 2011; Robles & Matos 2012; de Blok et al. 2001; Kuzio de Naray & Spekkens 2011; Kuzio de Naray & Kaufmann 2011; Boylan-Kolchin et al. 2014). The trend to reduce the inner loga-

*Electronic address: tmatos@fis.cinvestav.mx
**Electronic address: vrobles@fis.cinvestav.mx

rithmic slopes invokes astrophyisical processes such as radiation wind, supernovae feedback, etc. (Governato et al. 2010, 2012; Merrit et al. 2006; Graham et al. 2006), although this seems possible in LSB galaxies, the question remains for the fainter galaxies where one supernovae could blow out most of the gas due to the shallower gravitational potential.

Another discrepancy possibly related the overabundance of satellites (Klypin et al. 1999; Moore et al. 1999; Maciò et al. 2012; Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2014) is the Too-Big-to-Fail (Boylan-Kolchin et al. 2011; Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2014b) issue. The latter results from the higher number of massive dark matter halos around Milky-Way like host with the most massive galaxies observed in our local neighborhood, assuming the most massive galaxies are in the most massive dark matter halos, there should be about ~ 10 more around systems with virial masses comparable to our Milky Way or M31 (Andromeda) (Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2014b). There have been some possible solutions, most of them relying on tidal stripping in addition to supernovae feedback.

However, some of these discrepancies might also be solved assuming different properties for the dark matter, such as scalar field dark matter (SFDM) (Sin 1994; Lee & Koh 1996; Guzmán & Matos 1998; Matos & Ureña 2001), strongly self-interacting DM (Spergel & Steinhardt 2000; Vogelsberger,Zavala & Loeb 2012; Rocha et al. 2013), warm dark matter (Maciò et al. 2012).

It is of particular interest to us the SFDM alternative, here the mass of the field is assumed to be very small ($\sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$) such that its de Broglie wavelength is of order $\sim$ kpc, relevant for galactic scales. The quantum behavior of the field has created much interest in the model due to its success to account for some discrepancies mentioned above with dark matter properties only, for example, the small mass keeps the central density from increasing indefinitely due to the uncertainty principle in contrast to CDM simulations where supernova feedback is required(Governato et al. 2010, 2012; Pontzen & Governato 2012; Scannapieco et al. 2012).

2. SFDM: Previous work

The main idea in the scalar field dark matter model (Sin 1994; Ji & Sin 1994; Lee & Koh 1996; Guzmán & Matos 1998; Hu et al. 2000; Matos & Ureña 2001) considers a self-interacting scalar field with a very small mass, typically of $\sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$, such that the quantum mechanical uncertainty principle and the interactions prevent gravitational collapse in self-gravitating structures, thus the halos are characterized with homogeneous densities (usually referred as a cores) in their centers, in general the core sizes depend on the values of the mass and the self-interacting parameters (Colpi et al. 1986) (for a review see Suárez, Robles & Matos (2013); Rindler-Daller & Shapiro (2014)). From the particle physics point of view the most simple way to account for a scalar field with this features is adding a Higgs-like term with a mass $\sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$ to the standard model of particles (Matos & López-Fernández 2014).

Previous studies of the cosmological evolution of a scalar field with mass $m \sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$ have shown that the cosmological density evolution is reproduced and very similar to the one obtained from CDM (Matos & Ureña 2001; Chavanis 2011; Suárez & Matos 2011; Magaña et al. 2012; Schive, Chiueh, & Broadhurst 2014), there is consistency with the acoustic peaks of the cosmic microwave background radiation (Matos & Ureña 2001; Rodríguez-Montoya et al. 2010) and this small mass implies a sharp cut-off in the mass power spectrum for halo masses below $10^8\mathrm{M}_\odot$ suppressing structure formation of low mass dark matter halos (Matos & Ureña 2001; Marsh & Silk 2014; Bozek et al. 2014; Hu et al. 2000). Moreover, there is particular interest in finding equilibrium configurations of the system of equations that describe the field (Einstein-Klein-Gordon system) and of its weak field approximation (Schrödinger-Poisson(SP) system), different authors have obtained solutions interpreted as boson stars or later as dark matter halos showing agreement with rotation curves in galaxies and velocity dispersion profiles in dwarf spheroidal galaxies (Lee & Koh 1996; Böhmer & Harko 2007; Robles & Matos 2012, 2013; Lora et al. 2012; Lora & Magaña 2014; Martinez-Medina, Robles, & Matos 2015; Diez-Tejedor et al. 2014; Guzmán et al.

2014). So far the large and small scales observations are well described with the small mass and thus has been taken as a prefered value but the precise values of the mass and self-interaction parameters are still uncertain, tighter constraints can come from numerical simulations (Schive, Chiueh, & Broadhurst 2014) and modeling of large galaxy samples.

Recently the idea of the scalar field has gained interest, given the uncertainty in the parameters the model has adopted different names in the literature depending on the regime that is under discussion, for instance, if the interactions are not present and the mass is $\sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$ this limit was called fuzzy dark matter (Hu et al. 2000) or more recently wave dark matter (Schive, Chiueh, & Broadhurst 2014), another limit is when the SF self-interactions are described with a quartic term in the scalar field potential and dominate over the mass (quadratic) term, this was studied in (Goodman 2000; Slepian & Gooodman 2012) and called repulsive dark matter or fluid dark matter by (Peebles 2000).

Notice that for a scalar field mass of $\sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$ the critical temperature of condensation for the field is $\mathrm{T_{crit}} \sim m^{-5/3} \sim$TeV, which is very high, if the temperature of the field is below its critical temperature it can form a cosmological Bose Einstein condensate, if it condenses it is called Bose-Einstein condensed(BEC) dark matter (Matos & Ureña 2001; Guzmán & Matos 1998; Bernal et al. 2010; Robles & Matos 2013; Harko 2011; Chavanis 2011). Sikivie & Yang (2009) mentioned that axions could also form Bose-Einstein condensates even though their mass is larger than the previous preferred value, notice that the result was contested in Davidson & Elmer (2013), this suggest that the condensation process should be study in more detail to confirm it can remain as BEC dark matter. In Ureña-Lopez (2009), it was found that complex scalar field with $m < 10^{-14}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$ that decoupled being still relativistic will always form a cosmological Bose-Einstein condensate described by the ground state wave function, this does not preclude the existence of bosons with higher energy, particularly in dark matter halos.

We see that the smallness of the boson mass is its characteristic property and cosmological condensation is a likely consequence. The preferred mass of the scalar field dark matter points to be close to $\sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$, consistent with the above constraint, although there are still uncertainties on the mass parameter, in order to avoid confusion with the known QCD axion, we find it useful and appropriate to name the scalar field dark matter candidate, from the above characteristics we can define it as a particle with mass $m < 10^{-14}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$, we name this DM candidate the *psyon*.

It is worth emphasizing that despite the variety of names given to the model the main idea described above remains the same, it is the quantum properties that arise due to the small mass of the boson that characterize and distinguishes this paradigm, analoguous to the standard cosmological model represented by the CDM paradigm whose preferred dark matter candidates are the WIMPs (weakly interacting massive particles), one being the neutralino, we see that for all the above regimes SFDM, Repulsive DM, Axion DM, or any other model assuming an ultra light bosonic particle comprise a single class of paradigm, which we categorized as the *Quantum Dark Matter* (QDM) paradigm. As pointed before, in the QDM paradigm the small mass of the dark matter boson leads to the possibility of forming cosmological condensates, even for axions which are non-thermally produced and have masses in $10^{-3} - 10^{-6}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$ (Sikivie & Yang 2009), this is a characteristic property that distinguishes these dark matter candidates from WIMPs or neutrinos, namely, the existence of *bosons in the condensed state*, or simply *BICS*, thus the axion and psyon are BICS.

3. Scalar field dark matter halos

There has been considerable work in finding numerical solutions to the non-interacting SFDM in the non-relativistic regime to model spherically symmetric haloes (Guzmán & Matos 1998; Guzmán & Ureña-López 2004; Ureña-López & Bernal 2010; Bernal et al. 2010; Bray 2010; Kaup 1968), and also for the self-interacting SFDM (Böhmer & Harko 2007; Robles & Matos 2012; Colpi et al. 1986; Rindler-Daller & Shapiro 2012; Balakrishna et al. 1998; Goodman 2000), it is worth noting that as mentioned in Guzmán & Ureña-López (2004) for the weak field limit of the system that determines the evolution of a spherically symmetric

scalar field, that is, the Einstein and Klein-Gordon equations, for a complex and a real scalar field the system reduces to the Schrödinger-Poisson (SP) equations (Arbey et al. 2003). The contraints reported in Li et al. (2014), obtained by imposing that the SF behaves cosmologically as pressureless matter (dust), imply that the interacting parameter would be extremely small for the typical mass of $\sim 10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}/c^2$, therefore we expect that solutions to the SP system with no interactions would behave qualitatively similar to those when self-interactions are included, as supported by the similarity in the solutions of the non-iteracting case and those with a small self-coupling found in other works (Balakrishna et al. 1998; Colpi et al. 1986; Briscese 2011).

One characteristic feature of stationary solutions of the form $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-iE_n t}\phi(r)$ for the SP system is the appearance of nodes in the spatial function $\phi(r)$, these nodes are associated to different energy states of the SF, the zero node solution corresponds to the ground state, one node to the first excited state, and so on. These excited states solutions fit rotation curves (RCs) of large galaxies up to the outermost measured data and can even reproduce the wiggles seen at large radii in high-resolution observations (Sin 1994; Colpi et al. 1986; Robles & Matos 2013). However, halos that are purely in a single excited state seem to be unstable when the number of particles is not conserved (finite perturbations) and decay to the ground state with different decay rates (Guzmán & Ureña-López 2004; Balakrishna et al. 1998), though they are stable when the number of particles is conserved(infinitesimal perturbations). The ground state solution is stable under finite perturbations and infinitesimal perturbations (Bernal et al. 2010; Seidel & Suen 1990), but has difficulties to correctly fit the rotation curves in large galaxies because its associated RC has a fast keplerian behavior after reaching its maximum value, hence unable to remain flat enough at large radii.

One way to keep the flatness of the RC to large radii is to consider that bosons are not fully in one state, but instead coexist in different states within the dark halo, these multistate halos (MSHs) have been studied in some works (Bernal et al. 2010; Ureña-López & Bernal 2010; Matos & Ureña-López 2007; Robles & Matos 2013,b; Martinez-Medina, Robles, & Matos 2015). The size of the MSH is determined by the most excited state that accurately fits the RC for large radii, excited states are distributed to larger radii than the ground state, and in contrast to the halo with single state there are MSHs that are stable under finite perturbations provided the ground state in the final halo configuration has enough mass to stabilize the coexisting state (Ureña-López & Bernal 2010; Bernal et al. 2010).

Although there are still uncertainties in the stability of the MSHs, the appearance of bosons in excited states seems to be a straightforward consequences of quantum interference triggered by halo mergers as confirmed recently in Schive et al. (2014b), and possibly the internal evolution of the halo. Moreover, initial fluctuations that grow due to the cosmological expansion of the universe eventually separate from it and start collapsing due to its own gravity, at this time (known as turnaround) the halo can have a number of psyons that are in different states which depend on the the local environment. Depending on the number density of bosons populating the excited states we can have different fates for the halos (Robles et al. 2015).

On the other hand, including rotation in the halo might be needed, in fact, (Guzmán et al. 2014) have included rotation to axis-symmetric halos in the condensed state and show that it can lead to the flattening of the RCs, other works have also included rotation but in the context of MSHs in asymmetric configurations (Bray 2012), both studies suggest that rotation is a relevant ingredient in halo modeling, in fact it should be, in the end we observed rotation in galaxies embedded in dark halos. However, we require more detail studies to assess the goodness of the agreement with a large sample of galaxies, especially because there ara several surveys underway (e.g. GAIA, MANGA) that will provide precise data to test the viability of the standard and alternative dark matter models.

4. Conclusions

There are several DM models in the literature that are addressing some discrepancies found in the standard model of cosmology, one of them is the scalar field dark matter. The quantum prop-

erties of the field affect kpc scales due to the smalleness of the mass. The typical psyon of mass $m \sim 10^{-22} eV/c^2$ reproduces the cosmological evolution just like CDM, it reduces the halo abundance in the faint end of the halo mass function offering a possible solution to the unobserved excess of satellites, and the Heinsenberg uncertainty principle generates shallow central densities in dwarf halos contrary to the cuspy profiles found in CDM simulations. It is clear that the SFDM model worths further exploration, in particular, improving the contraints in the mass and interaction parameters such that we can distinguish unambiguously between CDM and SFDM.

This work was supported in part by DGAPA-UNAM grant IN115311 and by CONACyT Mexico grant 49865-E.

REFERENCES

Arbey A., Lesgourgues J., & Salati P., 2003, PRD, 68, 023511

Balakrishna, J., Seidel, E., & Suen, W.M. 1998, Phys. Rev. D, 58, 104004

Bernal, A., Barranco, J., Alic, D., & Palenzuela, C. 2010, in AIP Conf. Proc., 1083, 20-27

Böhmer, C.G., & Harko, T. 2007, JCAP06, 025

Boylan-Kolchin, M., Bullock, J. S., Kaplinghat, M. 2011, MNRAS, 415, L40

Boylan-Kolchin M., Bullock J.S., Garrison-Kimmel S., 2014, MNRAS, 443, L44

Bozek B., Marsh D.J.E., Silk J., Wyse R.F.G., 2014, arXiv:1409.3544

Bray, H. H. L. Bray, AMS Contemporary Mathematics Volume, vol. 599 (2013), 2010, arXiv:1004.4016

Bray H.L., 2012, arXiv:1212.5745

Briscese F., 2011, Phys.Lett.B, 696, 315

Burkert, A. 1995, ApJ, 447, L25

Colpi, M., Shapiro, S.L., & Wasserman, I. 1986, Phys. Rev. Lett., 57, 2485

Chavanis, P.H. 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 84, 043531

Davé, R., Spergel, D.N., Steinhardt, P.J., & Wandelt, B.D. 2001, ApJ, 547, 574

Davidson S., & Elmer M., 2013, JCAP12, 034

de Blok, W.J.G., McGaugh, S.S., Bosma, A., & Rubin, V.C. 2001, ApJ, 552, L23

de Blok, W.J.G. 2010, Adv. Astron., 2010, Article ID 789293, 14 pages.

Diez-Tejedor A., Gonzalez-Morales A.X., & Profumo S.,PRD, 2014, 90, 043517

Garrison-Kimmel, S., Boylan-Kolchin, M., Bullock, J. S., Lee, K. 2014, MNRAS, 438, 2578

Garrison-Kimmel, S., Boylan-Kolchin, M., Bullock, J. S., Kirby, E. N. 2014, MNRAS, 444, 222

Goodman J.,2000, New Astronomy 5, 103

Governato, F., Brook, C., Mayer, L., et al. 2010, Nature, 463, 203

Governato, F., Zolotov, A., Pontzen, A., et al. 2012, MNRAS, in press (arXiv:1202.0554v2)

Graham, A.W., Merrit, D., Moore, B., Diemand, J., & Terzić, B. 2006,ApJ, 132, 2701

Guzmán, F. S., & Matos, T. 1999, Astro. Nachr., 320, 97. Guzmán, F. S., & Matos, T. 2000, Class. Quant. Grav., 17, L9. arXiv:gr-qc/9810028.

Guzmán F.S., & Ureña-López L.A., 2004, PRD, 69, 124033

Guzmán F.S., Lora-Clavijo F.D., González-Avilés J.J., & Rivera-Paleo F.J., 2014, PRD, 89, 063507

Harko T., 2011, MNRAS, 413, 3095

Hu, W., Barkana, R., & Gruzinov, A. 2000, Phys. Rev. Lett., 85, 1158

Ji S.U.,& Sin S.J., 1994, PRD, 50, 3655

Kaup D.J., 1968, Phys. Rev., 172, 1331

Klypin, A., Kravstov, A. V., Valenzuela, O., Prada, F. 1999, ApJ, 522, 82

Kuzio de Naray, R., Martinez, G.D., Bullock, J.S., & Kaplinghat, M., et al., 2010, ApJ, 710, L161

Kuzio de Naray, R., & Kaufmann, T. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 3617

Kuzio de Naray, R. & Spekkens, K. 2011, ApJ, 741, L29

Lee J.W, & Koh I.G., 1996, PRD, 53, 2236

Li B., Rindler-Daller T., & Shapiro P.R., 2014, PRD, 89, 083536

Lora V., Magaña J., Bernal A., Sánchez-Salcedo F.J., & Grebel E.K., 2012, JCAP02 (2012) 011

Lora V., Magaña J.,2014, JCAP09, 011

Macciò, A. V., Paduroin, S., Anderhalden, D. et al., 2012 MNRAS, 424, 1105

Magaña J., Matos T., Suárez A., Sánchez-Salcedo F.J., 2012, JCAP 1210, 003

Marsh D.J.E., & Silk J., 2014, MNRAS, 437, 2652

Martinez-Medina L.A., Robles V.H., & Matos T., 2015, PRD, 91, 023519

Matos, T., & Ureña-López, L.A. 2001, Phys Rev. D, 63, 063506

Matos T., Ureña-López L.A., 2007, Gen. Relativ. Gravit., 39, 1279

Matos, T., & López-Fernández, R., arXiv:1403.5243

Merrit, D., Graham, A.W., Moore, B., Diemand, J., & Terzić, B. 2006,ApJ, 132, 2685

Moore, B., Ghigna, S., Governato, F. et al., 1999, ApJ, 524, L19

Navarro, J.F., Ludlow, A., Springel V., et al., 2010, MNRAS, 402, 21

Oh, S.H., de Blok, W.J.G., Brinks, E., Walter, F., & Kennicutt, R.C. Jr. 2011, AJ, 141,193

Peebles P.J.E., 2000, ApJ, 534, L127

Pontzen A., & Governato F., 2012, MNRAS, 421, 3464

Rindler-Daller T., Shapiro P.R., 2012, MNRAS, 422, 135

Rindler-Daller T., & Shapiro P.R., 2014, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 29, 1430002

Robles, V. H., & Matos, T. 2012, MNRAS, 422, 282

Robles V.H., & Matos T., 2013, ApJ, 763, 19

Robles V.H., & Matos T. 2013b, Phys. Rev. D 88, 083008

Robles V.H., Lora V., Matos T., Sanchez-Salcedo F.J.,2015, arXiv:1404.3424, in press.

Rocha M., Peter A.H.G., Bullock J.S. et al., 2013, MNRAS, 430, 81

Rodríguez-Montoya, I., Magaña, J., Matos, T., & Pérez, L.A. 2010, ApJ, 721, 1509

Scannapieco C., Wadepuhl M., Parry O.H. et al., 2012, MNRAS, 423, 1726

Schive H.Y., Chiueh T., & Broadhurst T., 2014, Nature Physics, 10, 496

Schive H.Y., Liao M.H., Woo T.P.,et al. 2014b, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 261302

Seidel E., & Suen W-M., 1990, PRD, 42, 384

Sikivie P., Yang Q., 2009, PRL, 103, 111301

Sin, S.J. 1994, Phys. Rev. D, 50, 3650

Slepian Z.,& Goodman J., 2012, MNRAS, 427, 839

Spergel, D. N., & Steinhardt, P. J. 2000, Physical Review Letters, 84, 3760

Suárez, A., & Matos, T. 2011, MNRAS, 416, 87

Suárez A., Robles V.H., Matos T., 2014, Astrophysics and Space Science Proceedings, 38, 107

Ureña-Lopez L.A., 2009, JCAP01, 014

Ureña-López L.A., & Bernal A., 2010, PRD, 82, 123535

van Eymeren, J.,Trachternach, C., Koribalski, B.S., & Dettmar, R.J. 2009, A&A, 505, 1

Vogelsberger M.,Zavala J., Loeb A., 2012, MNRAS, 423, 3740

This 2-column preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.